

REMARKS

Claims 1-34, 52-78 and 195-200 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Specifically, the Examiner finds the phrase “media objects conform to standardized protocol representing units of aural, visual or audio content,” indefinite. This phrase has been removed from the claims. Accordingly, this rejection is now moot.

Claims 1-34, 52-57, 61-78 and 195-200 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,029,045 (“Picco”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesies he extended to their attorney during an interview held on September 9, 2005. During the interview, it was explained that Picco does not describe or suggest the modification of individual media objects within a scene based on a user profile. The Examiner stated that if Applicants were to amend the claims to explicitly state that only one or more of the media objects within a scene, and not all of the media objects within the scene, were modified by a specific targeted content he would have to reconsider the patentability of the claims. In accordance with the Examiner’s suggestion, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 17, 26, 52, 66, and 73 to specify that the “targeted media object is part of a program composition comprising multiple media objects presented simultaneously and the targeted media object is targeted separately from at least one other media object in the composition.”

As described in the specification on page 6, line 16- page 7, line 3; page 16, lines 16-24; page 19, line 23-page 21 line 4; and Fig. 3, the present invention allows for one object in a program composition to be represented separately from another object in the composition. For example, as described in the specification, a program composition can include, for example, an automobile, a scenery or route upon which the automobile travels and an audio signal. Each of these objects can be targeted separately to a user allowing for a different combination of media objects to be played on different user systems without having to provide completely different program compositions for each type of user. For example, the background scenery can be targeted to the full broadcast audience and the automobile that drives on the route can be

separately targeted to specific consumers known to be interested in that type of car. This allows a truck to be targeted to one user and a sports car to be targeted to another user, while both users are provided the same background scene.


Since as explained in the amendment dated December 13, 2004, Picco only describes targeting a complete program to a user and does not describe targeting objects within a scene separately from other objects within a scene as claimed, the rejection of claims 1-34, 52-57, 61-78 and 195-200, should be withdrawn.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing Attorney Docket No. 559442004400. However, the Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Dated: September 13, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Jonathan Bockman

Registration No.: 45,640
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
1650 Tysons Boulevard, Suite 300
McLean, Virginia 22102
(703) 760-7769